



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Ordo Rachelis. By KARL YOUNG. [University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 4.] Madison, 1919.

Of the four types of liturgical play connected with the Nativity, three, the *Officium Stellae*, the *Processus Prophetarum*, and the *Officium Pastorum*, have already been studied in considerable detail. Professor Young now undertakes to do for the *Ordo Rachelis*, or *Interfectio Puerorum*, what has been done for the Magi, the Prophets, and the Shepherds plays by Anz, Sepet, and Professor Young himself, respectively.

He first considers all the Epiphany plays in which a dramatic treatment of the *Interfectio* is latent, tracing the stages by which they approach to an actual dramatization of this theme. The four texts in which he finds the *Ordo Rachelis* developed as a true dramatic unit he carefully re-edits from the manuscripts, analyzing them at some length and indicating their sources in the Vulgate and the liturgy. In the concluding sections of the study, the relations between these four texts are investigated, the views of Anz and Meyer criticized, and the question whether the *Ordo Rachelis* arose as a mere extension of the *Officium Stellae* or as a dramatic unit which developed independently and was later appended to the Epiphany play is clearly stated, if not categorically answered.

Unfortunately, the four texts that have survived differ considerably in content and scope: the Limoges *Lamentatio* is a dramatic trope rather than a play; in the Laon text the *Interfectio* forms an integral part of an *Officium Stellae*; and in the two long plays from Fleury and Freising, although Professor Young is probably justified in regarding the *Ordo Rachelis* as "a separate dramatic unit" (p. 23), this theme is nevertheless so extended and developed as to include a *Fuga in Egyptum* and, in the case of the Freising play, scenes from the *Pastores* as well.¹ From these texts and from the Epiphany plays discussed on pp. 6-13, it becomes apparent that

¹ Chambers indeed believes (*Mediaeval Stage*, II, 49-50) that at Fleury and Freising the *Pastores*, *Stella* and *Rachel* have coalesced. He not only suggests that the Freising *Ordo Rachelis* may be intended to supplement rather than replace the Freising *Ordo Stellae*, but he finds it impossible to regard the Fleury *Interfectio Puerorum* as a separate play from the *Herodes*.

the dividing line between the *Officium Stellae* and the *Ordo Rachelis* cannot be definitely drawn: the Laon text with its relatively simple *Interfectio* is in many respects as closely related to the Compiègne and Freising plays as to the Limoges trope for Innocents Day. Professor Young's conclusion, therefore (p. 65), that the dramatic trope represented by the Limoges text arose as a separate creation, but that its use at the end of the *Officium Stellae* probably preceded its use as an independent play, seems to me both circumspect and convincing.

That the solution of the problem of provenience is facilitated by considering the Innocents scenes apart from their context will readily be granted. One wishes, however, that in attempting to establish the textual relations existing between the various versions, Professor Young had extended his comparisons beyond these scenes to the scenes in the Epiphany plays with which they are most frequently connected and to the *officia* of which, in three instances, they form a part. (On p. 49, note 64, some parallels are suggested, but their bearing on the textual interrelations is not discussed.) The similarities between the Fleury and Freising plays, for example, are far more extended than the likenesses between their *Interfectio* scenes would indicate,² and the fact that the Freising *Ordo Stellae* and the Fleury *Ordo Rachelis* alone substitute *Armiger* for *Indolis* in the verse *Indolis eximie pueros fac ense perire* seems at least significant (the Freising *Rachel* reads *Etatis bime*, all the other plays, *Indolis*).³ Perhaps, too, the connections between the Fleury and Laon plays might have been further emphasized by a reference to the fact that the antiphon *Sinite parvulos* occurs in only two texts, those of Fleury and Compiègne, for the Compiègne text is in other respects closely related to the *Officium*

² The scenes preceding the *Interfectio* are conveniently compared in Davidson, *Studies in the English Mystery Plays*, pp. 50 ff. Note also the responsory *Aegypte, noli flere* used in the Flight scenes of both plays (Young, pp. 28, 49).

³ The Freising *Ordo Stellae*, like the Fleury *Ordo Rachelis*, also keeps the prose *Decerne, Domine* which the Freising *Rachel* omits. These facts seem to me to lend some support to Chambers' hypothesis regarding the two Freising plays (see above, note 1). Both the Freising texts as well as the Fleury play have the Sallust tag (*Incendium meum*) which occurs elsewhere in only two texts, one from Strassburg and one from Einsiedeln. (Cf. Anz, p. 136.)

from the nearby cathedral of Laon. These are minor matters, however, and probably not calculated to shed much light upon those ecclesiastical relations that somehow produced similar liturgical plays in the cathedral of Freising near Munich and the ancient abbey of Fleury-Saint-Benoit on the Loire. Agreeing in general with Anz, though rightly rejecting his hypothetical reconstructions as well as Wm. Meyer's mythical German derivations, Professor Young concludes (p. 63): "we are sure of a French tradition that includes Limoges and Laon and of a German tradition that includes Freising; and in some manner the two traditions seem to be united in Fleury."

The painstaking scholarship characteristic of all Professor Young's illuminating contributions to the field of the liturgical drama is evident on every page of this study. An index of some sort, especially to the newly collated texts, would, one feels, have increased its usefulness, but in any case it lays students not only of the liturgical plays but of the mediæval drama generally under a heavy obligation to its author.

GRACE FRANK.

Baltimore, Md.

CORRESPONDENCE

NOTE ON SPENSER'S CLARION

The fabric of the *Muiopotmos* has sustained an activity of scholarship hard on a thing so fragile. Are we breaking this delicate butterfly unnecessarily upon the wheel, by over-complexity of conjecture? In the very name of Clarion, not yet satisfactorily explained, there may be a clue to simpler interpretation.

Mr. Long's suggestion¹ that Clarion is Spenser the lover in toils of a lady-Aragnoll, assumes, as Miss Lyon rightly thinks, a kind of compliment acceptable indeed as a sonnet-conceit but likely to be trying to a lady on so protracted a scale. Her own ingenious idea,² that Clarion is Raleigh in rivalry with Essex, still makes no allowance for the mock-heroic tone in this bright epic of the air, a tone which it is easy to feel with Mr. Nadal,³ unless one has a thesis to prove. The older tradition,⁴ that Clarion is in some sense

¹ *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, ix (1914), 457-462.

² *PMLA.*, xxxi (1916), 90-113.

³ *PMLA.*, xxv (1910), 640, 656.

⁴ James Russell Lowell, *N. Am. Rev.*, 1875, p. 365.